☞ The Daily *Era* can be had every morning at the Periodical Stand of Mr. J. T. Bates, Exchange, Philadelphia; also, the Weekly *Era*.

☞ Mr. James Elliott is authorized to receive and receipt for subscriptions and advertisements for the Daily and the Weekly *National Era*, in Cincinnati and vicinity.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1854.

☞ Both Houses of Congress adjourned yesterday, until Monday next.

"HIRELING," EQUALITY, ETC.

The Southern States have an equal right with the North to all the Territories of the Union, and we would maintain it on every proper occasion. *There is nothing in the social or moral organization of the hireling States, which entitles them to a superiority over us.* We don't want a war of words about it, but the thing itself we will not surrender.—*Richmond (Va.) Whig.*

The *hireling* States! The *Whig* is complimentary; but it betrays the real feeling entertained by the Slaveholders towards the Northern States. "*Hireling* States!" They are considered always in the market, ready to be hired out to the highest bidder. The South holds the Administration with its patronage, and hires the North to do service for it. "O," said a chivalrous member from Kentucky, in relation to the Nebraska Bill, "we don't do such work ourselves; we can hire plenty of Northern men to work for us." The general calculation is, that the Administration, with its patronage, is good for at least forty Northern votes, in any emergency in which they may be required by the South. The division of Nebraska into two Territories was a lucky thought: it precisely doubled the offices to be filled. Two Governors, two Secretaries of State, six or ten judges, attorneys, marshals, agents, &c. How chances multiply for those disposed to please the Administration at the expense of their constituents!

Or, perhaps, the *Whig* sneers at the Northern States as hireling, because the People there hold that "the laborer is worthy of his hire." The *Whig* is enamored of a system which authorizes one man to extort the labor of another, without pay, and sell him to boot, if it so please him. An honorable system, this! No hireling labor here! The idea of paying wages, of rendering to every man a fair equivalent for his services, is decidedly vulgar. True nobility consists in living upon the unpaid earnings of the poor.

But, there are other points in this brief paragraph from the *Whig*.

It misrepresents the question in controversy. The question now is, not whether the North and South have equal rights, but whether a bargain or compact, agreed to by the two sections, in relation to the Old Louisiana Territory, shall be violated by the South, after it has received its full share of what was stipulated? Whether the North, after having been constrained by Southern influence to yield its principles and policy so far as to accept of that Compromise, shall be swindled out of the consideration which induced its acceptance?

Under still another aspect the *Whig* misrepresents the Question. The real issue involves the rights and interests of both North and South. Positive enactment by Congress excluding Slavery from Territories, applies to all the People of all the States. If the Southern man cannot hold slaves in the Territories, neither can the Northern. The restriction is not discriminating, although it may subject to special inconvenience the few owners of slaves who might wish to settle with them in our Territories. The prohibition of Slavery in the free States is absolute and without discrimination, operating as well in relation to visiters and sojourners as citizens, although it may subject to peculiar inconvenience the few persons from slave States who desire to carry their slaves with them wherever they go. The act abolishing the slave trade in 1808 bore with particular weight upon the interests of the class of slaveholders, by cutting off their supplies of labor from abroad; but it was no invasion of the equal rights of the South, for the act was general, applying without discrimination to all the People of all the States, prohibiting them all from engaging in or encouraging the slave trade.

If the greatest good of the greatest number should be studied by Government, the maintenance of the Missouri Compromise is a duty it owes to the masses of the People, in all sections. Of the twenty-five millions of the People of the United States, not more than two hundred and fifty thousand or three hundred thousand are slaveholders.

These, with the few persons directly dependent upon them, might be benefited, pecuniarily, in a very limited degree, by repealing the Compromise and throwing open Nebraska to Slavery; but how would the interests of the millions of non-slaveholders in both sections, be promoted? What they want is, Free Labor. The non-slaveholders of the South rejoice when they can find in new territory shelter from the desolations and oppressions of the Slave system. The non-slaveholders of the North ought not to be exposed in new Territory to the degrading competition of Slave labor. The exclusion of Slavery by Congressional enactment is a policy denounced alike by the interests of both—and Congress, in continuing it in force in Nebraska, does injustice to no section, asserts the superiority or inferiority of no section, but simply declares that the permanent welfare of some twenty millions of People, citizens of the United States, East, West, North, and South, is of more importance than the petty pecuniary gain, or the selfish political aims, of a small class of persons, confined to one section of the Union, interested in upholding an institution, not only purely sectional and exceptional, but unfavorable to the great ends for which the Union was established, and repugnant to the fundamental principles of its Government.

☞ In the list of members of the Minnesota Legislature, we see that five members were born in Maine; three in New Hampshire; three in Ohio; one in Pennsylvania; one in Massachusetts; one in Virginia; one in Wisconsin, and one in Missouri.

☞ Wm. Pitt Fessenden (Whig) was yesterday elected to the United States Senate, by the Legislature of Maine, for six years from the 4th of March next.

THE FAMOUS CASE OF LORD STIRLING.

We understand that the Press is beginning to take notice of this important case. One more remarkable has rarely come before us; and never, we believe, have we heard of one more deserving the sympathies of the People of this country, both on account of the baseness of the efforts to falsify law and facts, and because there are really interests at stake which might, and ought, to be made available for the purpose of retrieving the bungling diplomacy of 1818 in regard to the Fisheries.

Our readers may recollect that, in August of last year, some notice was drawn to the case by the announcement that a company was formed for the purpose of trying the question in the Law Courts, as to the right of Great Britain to the Fishery grounds. The ground of this pretension was, that Lord Stirling actually possessed in law, by acts judicial and royal, seisin or lawful right over the whole. And this is perfectly true.

The Government of England, although it could not openly violate the sanctity of the law, nor deny the act of the sovereign made in conformity with that law, sought, while holding Lord Stirling quiet under pretence of compromising with him for his immense rights, by underhand means, to undo what it had vainly sought to defeat in open court.

They accordingly commenced an illegal action against Lord Stirling by means of a treacherous agent; which action ought to have been dismissed at the onset, having been in open violation of the law and practice of the British courts. And this was recently declared to be illegal in the House of Lords. But the agitation in the Canadas, subsequent to the establishment of Lord Stirling's right in 1831, was such that the judges of Scotland, at the desire of the Government, tolerated this illegal action, for the *purpose of giving the impression* that the right had not been established.

To fully comprehend these points, those of our readers who are curious for details must consult the able work of Mr. J. L. Hayes, now about to be republished. Every man ought to read and understand it.

As, however, our subscribers may desire to have a few facts on the case, we will state some leading points; the more so, as agents of England have been remarkably active in falsifying the truth, and in all their attacks have carefully ignored the judgments in Lord Stirling's favor.

We shall divide what we have to say into two parts: the right of Lord Stirling to his title, and the right to his property. Of the first, we, in this country, care nothing. We, of course, in courtesy allow every man the name or distinction to which he is entitled in his own country. But in this case it is necessary to consider it, because it cannot well be separated from the fact of legal right to the property.

Lord Stirling took up his title in 1825, having been acknowledged and received according to Scotch forms by the assembled peers of Scotland, to whom his right was well known. He has ever since sat and voted with them. When the Crown of England began to be afraid of his establishing his right to the British Provinces, which had been granted by five charters to his ancestor, *and all confirmed by act of Parliament*, it opened an opposition in the Court of Session against his right to the Earldom of Stirling. The case was argued before the whole bench of thirteen judges, who (February 9, 1830) *unanimously* sustained his right. It subsequently came before the Lord Chancellor of England, who likewise recognised his right. It was likewise dragged on a quibble before the Courts of Queen's Bench and Common Pleas, which on each occasion sustained the other judgments. It likewise was recognised by the King in Council, in August, 1831, in a most formal manner. And finally, when the illegal action, commenced in 1833, was brought into the House of Lords, it was finally admitted before that tribunal—the highest in Great Britain—and before which no man can present himself, bearing a name or character not recognised or established according to law.

Hence, on the point of *title*, there has not been an instance on record in Great Britain, of such repeated and unanimous recognition.

The reader, surprised, will perhaps ask, Why, then, this persevering opposition? The answer is simple enough; and we give it in the words used by many British Ministers—that "the claims involved political consequences of such moment, that the Government was afraid to grapple with them." This is the key to the whole mystery.

Now, as to the property. The Scotch law requires certain forms to be gone through, before an heir can enter into possession of his lands, and the rights appertaining to them. All these Lord Stirling fulfilled. He obtained *four* verdicts of Juries, of 15 men each—and finally, after the last or special Jury, the King, William IV, on a writ issued from Chancery, gave him, in the castle of Edinburgh, seisin or legal possession of all his lands and rights. These lands comprise the whole of the Canadas, Nova Scotia, &c, and the Fisheries. By that instrument of seisin, the charters confirmed by act of Parliament became again the law of those countries, giving the Provinces in fact, through Lord Stirling's rights, entirely independent of Government.

On the completion of that act, on the 8th of July, 1831, a great dinner was given to Lord Stirling, in Edinburgh, at which Mr. Robertson, advocate, who had been Chancellor of the last Jury, and is now Lord Robertson, Judge of the Court of Sessions, addressed the Earl in a complimentary speech, in which he remarked that "the law of Scotland had now done for him all that it could do to invest him with his rights," &c.

We must, at this point, say a few words in regard to Scotch Juries on questions of heirship. We have the testimony of many Judges to their superiority over the common Jury—and among them, Mr. Hayes gives that of a Judge singularly hostile to Lord Stirling, on account of the "political character," as he chose to term it, of his case. He quite ridiculed a common Jury, in comparison with the highly respectable Juries in Lord Stirling's case. The reason is obvious. The common Jury, from incapacity or want of habit, is rarely able to grasp the value of evidence, and takes its cue after the last speaker, or some obstinate fellow Juror; while in this system of Scotch Jury, men of a different stamp sit upon it. As for instance, in all Lord Stirling's Juries, the majority were Advocates, writers to the Signet, or Solicitors—the very men most capable of sifting documentary evidence; and through this severe ordeal did Lord Stirling go, *four times*. His case is the more strengthened, as in the case of the Title, by opposition; for on the latter Juries, in particular, lawyers presented themselves and sat on the Jury, who intended no favor to Lord Stirling, (the Crown lawyers watching the proceedings,) and yet they *unanimously concurred in the verdicts in his favor.*

To deceive the public on the importance of these verdicts, (as the character of these Juries is unknown out of Scotland,) the opponents of Lord Stirling have had recourse to falsehoods. For instance, some months ago, an *Englishman* imposed a statement upon the editors of the New York *Tribune*, which they accepted and repeated in good faith, to the effect that these Juries are assembled by the *macers* of the court, and before this "drunken tribunal" Lord Stirling went!

The reader will hear with surprise that the statement is a *pure invention*. Yet upon such "facts" has the whole slanderous opposition of agents of the British Government been based. Years before Lord Stirling came before the courts, the habit of employing *macers* to summon a Jury in the absence of a Judge, was abolished by act of Parliament; and all his Jury were assembled and acted under the improved and strict system instituted by the act of 1821. We have for obvious reasons enlarged upon this matter.

It was after "the law had done all it could do to invest Lord Stirling with his rights," that negotiations were opened with the British Government. They were chiefly characterized by shuffling and duplicity—their course was first interrupted by a forgery at the Colonial Office in London, the object of which was to get Lord Stirling to a place from which he could be carried away or kidnapped. The forgery was the act of the Private Secretary of the Colonial Minister, at the instigation of his chiefs. All these details, with letters and proofs, were published by the eminent London publishers, Ridgway & Co., and again in Edinburgh in 1835. Copies are in the Capitol Library, and in Mr. Peter Force's and other collections.

The agitation in the Canadas, and the acts of Lord Stirling in thwarting Government schemes in Parliament, were the cause of this project to extinguish him quietly.

It was immediately after this had failed, that, by gaining an agent of Lord Stirling, an illegal action, in May, 1833, was commenced against him, to *give the impression*, at home and abroad, that his case was not settled! The judges would not dismiss it. *They wanted to hold Lord Stirling's hands, while they plundered his lands and sought means to tranquillize the Canadas.*

In the mean time, a number of other documents came up, and a host of evidence and witnesses, to strengthen the case; and, finally, in 1837, a document was stolen from the Foreign Office in France, and sent to Lord Stirling, duly certified.

The officers of State in Scotland, on inquiry, received from Paris assurances of its genuineness; and one of them thereupon congratulated Lord Stirling's counsel upon it. But some of those gentlemen formed a plan for getting the office closed to further identification of the document, and proposed charging it as a forgery; trusting to their influence to get the present witnesses and other proofs out of the way!

The plan was carried out partially, and thus originated the pretended charge of forgery, of which Blackwood gave an entirely fictitious account, some three years ago. In point of fact, we have reason to believe this charge was merely got up to hide more effectually the real Colonial Office Forgery; for the document charged as a forgery by Lord Stirling, consisted of *seventeen lengthy writings, all in the handwritings of the parties who signed them.* If they had charged a mere forgery of signatures, that might have been possible; but here, a man was actually charged with a deed that was *physically impossible*, and which the united testimony of witnesses for and against Lord Stirling declared would have defied a whole academy! Besides, it was in a foreign language, and perfectly exact in the idioms and expressions of the time, &c. But what is final: Lord Stirling accidentally discovered documentary proof of its existence *fifty years ago*; and also an old English gentleman, who had seen it at that time.

In short, we do not know an instance of such reiterated outrages, as the whole illegal opposition to this established right has given rise to. The British Government, we understand, now indignantly denies that it had any hand in this bad business. But did it not wink at it? Was it really deceived by the Crown agents, who had an interest of some two or three hundred thousand dollars, to break up the case?

Lord Stirling not only established his case in law, but every opposition strengthened him. Why, then, persecute and ruin a man, because his rights are undeniable?

Now, in our view, this case involves two points of importance: 1st. As to the Fishery title, which affects us; and, 2d, as to the violation of law and solemn judgments in the person of an individual, which by every moral and human law affects all other individuals who have always rights to assert and maintain.

1. As to the Fishery question, it is clear, by the above mentioned facts, that we have been treating with a party (the British Government) which for years has had no right or title to the Fishing grounds; the same having been solemnly conceded by an act of the British Sovereign, in the form of a royal act of seisin, issued out of Chancery in Scotland, on the 8th July, 1831, in consequence of the establishment of the right of Lord Stirling to the same by the laws of his country.

Such being the facts, are we doing right in continuing to treat with the British Government? Will any of our countrymen blame us for saying, that we are bound by every principle of honor to act justly, whether it be towards an individual or a nation; and that we think, since Providence has pointed out a way to repair the blunder committed by our statesmen in 1818, that we ought to take advantage of it? We consider it the more imperative so to do, because the method, thus pointed out to us, *is one perfectly legal*, and, we do not hesitate to say, *peaceful*, for restoring our ruined fishermen and our declining Fishing towns to that activity and prosperity to which they are so fully entitled.

2. As to the violation of law and judicial acts, in the person of an individual: every free man knows that it is the accumulation of individual wrongs that is the corrupt source of national wrong. If a right in the individual be injurious to the community, the same can and should be removed, but never without compensation. In this instance, the individual has repeatedly offered to accept of moderate compensation; but that has been withheld, simply because a few *other* individuals were envious and fearful of the immensity of the rights; and because Lord Stirling "obstinately" refused TO SHARE *with the underlings of the Crown*, who had made him repeated propositions.

In coming over to this country, and appealing to us, as an enlightened and liberal People, at the very moment most auspicious in the Fishery negotiation, we cannot believe that Lord Stirling will have reason to regret the step. He will find here more activity in supporting right and denouncing wrong. As a general rule, the "feet of the wicked are swift to evil;" while the well disposed rarely show either diligence, courage, or unanimity, in sustaining the persecuted. Here it is that the bold few trample upon, and, by their activity and united action, triumph over individuals; while the many, timid and careless, shrug their shoulders, sigh over the violation of rights and justice, or try to give credit to inconsistent falsehoods, if they do not even approve them by blaming the persecuted for a position from which they could by no possibility escape.

We have to say, in conclusion, that, in making this statement of Lord Stirling's position, we have done so from pure, disinterested motives. We have had the pleasure of his acquaintance and that of his family residing in Washington, and we can bear testimony to their perfect integrity and honorable bearing. We think the country ought to be supplied with the facts of the case. We therefore draw attention to them, because we have reasons for believing that there has been much activity displayed in preventing a consideration of the case by the country, through the agency of the Press. We have read all the attacks upon Lord Stirling and his rights; and we do not remember ever to have met with such an overwhelming refutation of calumny as that given by Mr. Hayes in his "Vindication."

To the wild assertions and slanders of the opposition, he has not only refuted them by the publication of the facts—*i. e.*, the acts royal, judicial, and official, the verdicts and judgments of courts, &c.—but he demonstrates upon irrefragable proof that crimes of the darkest character have been committed, for the purpose of destroying documentary evidence and obliterating official proofs upon which the case is based.

The San Francisco Disaster.—The Court of Inquiry upon this subject, now in session at New York, (Major General Scott presiding,) is eliciting a minute history of great interest, but of course develops no new leading facts.

For the National Era.

GERMANY AND ENGLAND—NO. 3.

I trust you have borne in mind the general idea I started out with, to wit: a feeling of complaint at one-sided English reading, and attempts to make England alone the predecessor of our institutions.

I am sure, that to an experienced politician, as you are, it must have frequently occurred, that in all efforts for reform, this self-same one-sided English reading has been the main obstacle. It is the great barrier to law reform this day, as it was to Jefferson's strict construction doctrine, and as it was to Jackson's views on the currency, and to many other liberal views. Nay, let me ask you, very humbly, indeed, and without the slightest desire to offend, whether it has not been the stumbling block of a certain powerful party in the United States, that they hankered after English notions of Government? Where did they get their baneful class and special legislation?—where nine-tenths of their notions? Was it not, and is it not now, a most grievous political error, one that must lead us astray continually, to take it for granted that our Government sprung from the British, and that it is like it; and that, therefore, to understand ours, we must study theirs? I had supposed that eye-teeth had been cut enough by this time, to let the important truth spread beyond the Atlantic, that the United States Constitution must ever be viewed comparatively, but weighed abstractly. Its mother was Necessity, its cradle a New World, and its godfathers were men who looked beyond narrow national circles, and who, reasoning abstractly from the experiences of many nations, gave us a Government with few well-defined powers. They were misers in the storehouse of political power.

I have no wish to charge upon them that they copied from Germany the confederative idea, only I am sure they did not get it in England. I would but suggest, that it might be profitable to American statesmen, to read a little more of German history than they have been in the habit of doing, and I can but promise them that such a study will widen the circle of their thoughts, and that there they will find many knotty questions, which we have either passed over or which are yet to be settled, presented in somewhat familiar form, and likely to shed light upon the subject.

Why is it that nearly every German coming to the United States falls so easily into our form of Government? Why do they, with few exceptions, like it? Why are they, almost unanimously, States Rights men?

Why, on the other hand, does almost every Englishman, instinctively, dislike our form of Government? Why are nearly all our Governmental operations repugnant to his feelings?

These questions, pondered over without prejudice, must shed much light upon the issue I have presented. They are not put forth as mere invidious comparison.

I have presumed upon a former personal acquaintance with you, Mr. Editor—with whom to differ, or to agree, politically, makes no break in friendly relations—to send you these suggestive views of mine. You will bear me witness, that I cannot be charged with neglecting English reading, and that I have not written the foregoing with a view to disparage or undervalue the services which many an Englishman has, in former and more recent times, rendered to the progress of rational freedom. I have always read, with pleasure, (and profit, I trust,) the standard English authors. But I must frankly admit that one great drawback herein has been, the ever-present self-laudatory assumption, that England is the paragon in Governmental progress—an assumption not warranted in truth. From such one-sided records, I love to return to the history of the nation within which has ever beat Europe's intelligent heart, and where liberty and national justice, and pre-eminently the latter, have been practical household words.

I may have given to the words of your correspondent a meaning he did not intend to convey. If so, I shall regret it. I shall follow his articles with due attention, and, following up the ideas I have suggested, may give, hereafter, a brief historical outline of the old Germanic institutions.

Much rather, however, would I see some abler pen than mine undertake this task; and to such a one I bespeak your readers' kind attention.

TUISKO.

MR. EVERETT.

A correspondent of the New York *Commercial Advertiser*, writing from this city on the 8th instant, says:

"Mr. Everett has made to-day one of the most fascinating and splendid speeches that he ever made on any subject. His views of the question were considerate, calm, and practical. The comparative merits of Slavery and Freedom did not come within the scope of his argument; nor was it necessary to take up that topic, in order to reply to and refute the arguments upon which Mr. Douglas has placed his proposition for the repeal of the Missouri Compromise."

We are sorry that any friend of Mr. Everett should find it necessary to make such an apology in his behalf to the people of the North.

Spain.—The New York *Tribune* says "that there *has* been a *coup-d état* in Spain, and that on the 16th of January a Council of Ministers determined to punish sundry refractory politicians, and, accordingly, the following Generals were subjected to a decree of exile: Manuel Concha to the Canaries; Jose Concha (late Captain General of Cuba) to Majorca; O'Donnell (also an ex-Captain General of Cuba) to the Canaries; Infante to Ivica; and Armero to Leon; and the whole lot had to decamp next day; and that, besides these, sixty of the Parliamentary opposition are to be exiled, and some journalists also will be packed off; and that the following decrees are resolved upon—suppression of the Senate; suppression of the Royal Council; Constitutional Reform, of course in the sense of absolutism; assembling of the Cortes; and changes in the tariff are spoken of.

FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE OF THE ERA.

London, *Jan.* 24, 1854.

To the Editor of the National Era:

Upon the strange rumor of which we deemed it consistent with our duty, as faithful correspondents, to furnish you with an early notice, our conservative and liberal journals have since busied themselves; but it is only within the last three days that the *Times* and *Chronicle* (Ministerial papers) have even glanced at the subject, and, on Wednesday and Thursday, written what is known by the name of "leading articles" upon it. Till Parliament meets, there is no likelihood of an eclaircissement. Prince Albert has not been sent to the Tower, as credited over half the country; nor has any substantial accusation been brought against him on responsible authority. But is it all invention—a mere clumsy device of the enemy against a Prince who, up to the moment, appeared to have no enemy, and, on the contrary, to have gathered golden opinions from all sorts of men? This seems improbable; and we should not have ventured to anticipate the forthcoming storm, even by a hint to your readers, for which you are held answerable, had we not had apparently good reasons for our statement. It may turn out that an indiscreet letter (such as we have intimated) has led to all this injurious turmoil, (for, however it turns, the public impression will be injurious,) and that neither Queen, Prince, foreign Sovereign, or Minister, are compromised with our continental relations. At the writing hereof we should be guilty of imprudence, and perhaps of error, were we to say more.

The alleged interference with the business and patronage of the Horse Guards is a *general* talk, on which, as *civilians*, we give no opinion.

With regard to the Cabinet, which certain politicians believed would not meet the Parliament *en masse*, it is now thought they will; and this very assault upon the fair fame of Prince Albert forms almost a paramount obligation upon every individual member to do so. For, whoever did not, would be set down by the Court as a foe to the Queen and her consort, and, by the popular voice, as countenancing the charges alluded to. Thus, whether the late rivet holds longer or not, it must hold over this crisis; and after that the Deluge! or, in other words, the question of Eastern policy pursued by the Ministry. That their coldness was suspected was made evident by the publication of the first manifesto by Drouyn de l'Huys, the gist of which was to nail the British Government to a decided course of co-operative action against Russia. The Frenchman doubted, and he put it to this public test. It was for no other reason that document appeared in the *Moniteur*. It was to screw England to the sticking place; and it appears to have done so, if there was any previous tardiness, which we hardly believe there was—only a suspicion; and as our organs persisted in maintaining a strict silence, all sorts of interpretations necessarily followed.

Inland, we have little to report. Two centenarians have died of the hard winter, one of them named Rose—the last rose of winter. From the census, it appears that, out of the millions of population, only 115 attain this extreme age. Some one at Christmas wished ——— (above 80) many happy years, and he answered, "Thank you, but do you think it desirable?" Men ought to get through the host of their worldly concerns a quarter of a century before that period!

Among the clever swindles of the age, the manufacture of spurious gold dust, instead of forgery, or coining base money, ought to be recorded. The imitation is excellent, and the absence of *weight* alone protects buyers from *heavy* impositions when the ingenious rascals come down with their dust.

The bank returns exhibit five millions less bullion than at this date a year ago. The strikes still hold out, and the lower orders get more pressed by the high price of provisions. Such is our internal economy for the re-assembling of the representatives of the people.

From abroad we have no news of worth—all being absorbed in the expected determination of the Russian Emperor.

The Duchess of Orleans has promulgated a letter to the Duke de Nemours, in which she declares her reasons for not joining in the Bourbon fusion, on the part of her son. What his rights are it would be difficult to define. As the grandson of Louis Philippe, he has no claim to legitimacy whilst the elder dethroned branch has a descendant, and he has no elective title to set up in lieu of birth. But a mother's ideas do not often agree with abstract politics.

From Vienna it is stated that very great and wise efforts are being made to restore the finances, currency, and credit of the Empire to a healthful condition; and from the enormous amount of the State property, it is believed that this vast reformation can be readily effected. The reduction of the army might therefore be true, and the desire for peace if possible, and for neutrality, at the worst, be the most urgent policy of Austria.

It is estimated that the value of public lands for railroads, asked from this session of Congress, according to the bills introducted or projected, amounts to the enormous sum of $350,000,000.

From the New York Evening Post.

OPINIONS OF THE NEWSPAPER PRESS.

A member of Congress at Washington innocently observed, the other day, that on the Nebraska bill he had no opinion of his own, but would vote as his constituents might prescribe. "His constituents," says the *National Era*, "live in Wisconsin, the people of which have not yet received the papers containing the last bill of Mr. Douglas."

On that point, we predict, the member will be properly enlightened before the measure is brought to a vote, if Mr. Douglas and his fellow conspirators can be restrained from hurrying it through the two Houses before the people are aware of what they are doing. We have before us the *Daily Wisconsin*, published at Milwaukee, no friend of agitating the slave question, and a decided supporter of the Administration. It condemns the Nebraska fraud in emphatic terms. We copy its remarks entire:

"*Attempted Repeal of the Missouri Compromise.* — Three-and-thirty years ago, after an agitation and an excitement which came near severing the American Union, the Missouri Compromise was adopted, and it is well known, too, by Southern votes. As one of the considerations of that Compromise, Missouri was admitted into the Union as a slave State, and in all the territory north of 36 deg. 30 min. Slavery was 'forever prohibited.' That Compromise has grown stronger and stronger in the affections of the people, until now, after the lapse of thirty years, it was considered almost as sacred as the Constitution itself; and yet, at this late day, an effort is being made for its repeal. That Compromise has been solemnly sanctioned by seven successive Presidents, Monroe, Adams, Jackson, Van Buren, Tyler, Polk, and Fillmore, and fourteen Congresses. In truth, it was considered as decisively settled as any human enactment could be.

"Now, is it not manifest that the effort to rip up and violate this solemn Compromise will create a dangerous agitation? It is a most unwise movement; for it will stir up all the old Slavery fires which it was supposed were settled forever. But if compacts are to be broken, after one party has obtained the consideration therefor, what faith can the sound and the patriotic repose in any compromise or any law?

"But as this grave question has to be met, we do not doubt that the freemen of the West will show themselves worthy of their past history; and, as they live in a country which is developing the greatest power and the greatest happiness to the people under Jefferson's favorite Ordinance of 1787, they will not readily yield to the repeal of a Compromise which has been regarded as scarcely less sacred than the immortal Ordinance of 1787."

The journal from which we have quoted expresses in these words an opinion of the bill which is universal in Wisconsin. In a short time, we shall hear from the German population of that State, whose hostility to the bill is certain.

After the foregoing part of this article was in type, we received the *Wisconsin Demokrat*, a German newspaper published at Manitowoc, in the State of Wisconsin. In this sheet, bearing date January 31st, we find a brief but significant article on Mr. Douglas's bill, which we here lay before our readers in a translation:

"Senator Douglas's bill for the organization of the Territory of Nebraska, which we have already mentioned, contains the clause, that the Missouri Compromise of 1820, which establishes the line of 36 deg. 30 min. as the boundary of Slavery, shall not be applied to Nebraska, but that the question of the introduction or non-introduction of Slavery shall be left to the decision of the settlers of the new Territory. The free voice of the settlers of the Territory is put forward as a Democratic principle, but the secret motive is the extension of Slavery. Senator Douglas, a Democratic candidate for the next Presidency, wishes to recommend himself by this bill to slaveholders; and, although himself from the free State of Illinois, he owns, through his wife, plantations and slaves in Louisiana. Hence his zeal for the untrammelled vote of the new Territory on the slave question, and the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. But what becomes of the Baltimore platform, which forbids all and any agitation of the Slavery question, since this bill must excite the most violent agitation in the press throughout the country?"

A Call.—We quote the following from the Chester (Pennsylvania) *Republican*, Feb. 10:

"*The First Movement.*—We understand that a public meeting of the people, without party distinction, who are opposed to the movement now being made in Congress to create new *slave* Territory north of the Missouri Compromise line, will be held at the Town Hall, in this Borough, on Saturday evening, the 18th inst. The introduction of chattel Slavery into Nebraska is one of the great questions of the day, and it behooves the free citizens of this Republic, who have any regard for the preservation of a right long since secured to them by solemn compact, to meet together and protest in the most earnest manner against any encroachment upon that right, such as is now about to be attempted by the advocates and supporters of Southern institutions. It is the duty of every man who desires the peace and prosperity of his country to resist unflinchingly every effort to abrogate the Missouri Compromise; and to this end we hope the friends of Freedom in this country will bestir themselves in such a manner as to them may seem meet, in order that our Senators and Representatives in Congress may learn their position on this important measure.

"We are authorized to say that Dr. Elder and John Sheddon, Esq., of Philadelphia, will be present to address the meeting."

From the same paper we quote the following:

"*Senator Cooper.*—Rumor says that Mr. Cooper, United States Senator from this State, will vote for Douglas's bill to extend Slavery into Nebraska. Can this be true? Mr. Cooper voted for the Compromise Measures of 1850, as he declared at that time, to quiet agitation. In doing so, he alienated thousands of devoted and attached friends. Will he go still further, and vote for the infamous measure now before the Senate, and open anew the agitation he then so much deprecated? We hope, for the honor of Pennsylvania and the reputation of her Senators, that he will be governed by the sentiments of his constituents on this subject."

☞ The New York '*Mirror*' proposes an act for the suppression of drunkenness in that State. It provides that when any person shall be found drunk, it shall be the duty of the police officers to arrest such person, and detain him or her in some suitable place until sober, and then take the person before a Justice of the Peace, who shall ascertain, by oath or other satisfactory evidence, by whom the liquor was sold to such drunken person. The party convicted of furnishing the liquor shall be fined not less than $25 nor more than $100. If the party fail to pay the fine, they shall be committed to jail, there to remain until the fine is paid, or until the imprisonment shall be equal to one day for every fifty cents of said fine.

A man from the country went into a New York fashionable church on Sunday, and found all the unoccupied pews that had cushions in them locked, and a poor invalid tried in vain to find a comfortable seat. The countryman said the text was most appropriately selected, being as follows: "The spirit of the Lord is upon me to preach glad tidings to the poor."

☞ "When shall we be favored with the continuation of Herbert's Romance? The chapters already given are uncommonly brilliant."—*A Correspondent.*

We commenced this story, by Henry W. Herbert, some months ago. The chapters were furnished with tolerable regularity till the close of last year, when they were interrupted; and we heard nothing more from the author till a week ago, when he sent us another chapter, accompanied with a note, stating that he had been suffering very severely from a distracting neuralgia in the head. We have concluded not to resume the publication till we can have enough of the story in hand to insure us against any more breaks in it. Mr. Herbert, we are sorry to say, has subjected us and our readers to much vexation.

THE NEBRASKA BILL IN THE PENNSYLVANIA LEGISLATURE.

In the Senate, on the 8th instant, Mr. Kimball, of Dauphin county, submitted the following preamble and resolutions:

Whereas efforts are now being made to effect the passage of an act of Congress to organize the Territory of Nebraska, with the provisions allowing the existence of involuntary servitude north of 36 degrees 30 minutes; and

Whereas, in the judgment of the General Assembly of Pennsylvania, the passage of such an act would be inexpedient and a manifest violation of the Missouri Compromise, approved March 6, 1820: Therefore,

Resolved, That the General Assembly of Pennsylvania earnestly and solemnly protests against the repeal of that section of the act of Congress for the admission of Missouri into the Union as a State, which prohibits involuntary servitude north of 36 deg. 30 min.

Resolved, That the Governor be requested to transmit a copy of the foregoing resolution to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Mr. Darsie, of Alleghany, moved to go into the consideration of the resolution forthwith.

The yeas and nays, being demanded, were taken—yeas 16, nays 14. There not being two-thirds in favor of the motion to consider the resolve *now*, it was lost.

From the Raleigh (N. C.) Register.

NEBRASKA.

We have heretofore said that the opinion is entertained that Slavery will not exist in Nebraska, whatever be the legislation of Congress in the premises.* We find that this opinion was expressed by Senator Douglas himself, in his speech in the Senate, a few days since. Taking him at his word, he expects to make a free State of Nebraska, after all; and yet he hopes to ingratiate himself with the South by his proposition to repeal the Missouri Compromise, and to convert it into a stalking-horse upon which he may ride into the Presidency.

It is very clear that he intends to reserve the wheat for the North, while he makes an ostentatious display of generosity in giving the chaff to the South. He "holds the word of promise to the ear, and breaks it to the hope," and expects to be made President for his magnanimity.

It is untrue, as charged by those doughty knights of secession chivalry, the "Richmond *Enquirer*," "*South Side Democrat*," and as intimated by the "*Standard*," that we have expressed opposition to the bill of Mr. Douglas. We have done no such thing. We have simply ventured a doubt as to the *policy*, under all the circumstances, of repealing the Missouri Compromise, and this doubt is shared, in common with us, by most of the conservative and reliable journals and men of the South. But the question is before us, and if any issue must be made up, the South will be united on every question that concerns her welfare or her honor! We do say, however, that we have not a particle of faith in the motives of those who have set "this ball in motion." Douglas understands that class of Southern politicians who are known as abstractionists. Concede to them that certain resolutions truly expound the Constitution in all imaginable and unimaginable cases, and that they, the said abstractionists, are the true and legitimate successors of the men of '89, and they want no more. You may take the Territories and make what you please of them, provided you stand on the abstractionist platform.

* We showed in our Saturday's issue the fallacy of this notion.—*Ed. Era.*

ARRIVAL OF STEAMER GEORGE LAW.

The mail steamer George Law, John McGowan, Esq., commanding, left Aspinwall at 7.15, A. M., on the 1st instant, and arrived at New York yesterday morning, at 9 o'clock.

She brings the California mails of January 16th, $809,141 in treasure on freight, and 308 passengers.

The Panama railroad is so far completed as to allow the cars to run to Obispo, nineteen miles from Panama, and the transit of the Isthmus is easily made in one day.

We have Panama papers to the 30th of January. The *Star* of that date says that the Panama end of the railroad is in that complete condition, that, if the locomotives, which are on the way, had arrived, they could be very conveniently and successfully employed.

The *Star* gives the following as the substance of the report of the Darien expedition, which went out by the British steamer Virago to explore the canal route:

"The party crossed the country until they got within about eight miles of the Atlantic, of which ocean they had an excellent view. They encountered a plain of some twenty-two miles in length, and in no part of it did they find the elevation greater than fifty feet above the level of the sea. The party did not go fully across, as their provisions gave out, and they were satisfied as to the route. During the entire trip, the party did not encounter a solitary Indian; they saw one hut."

The *Star* of an earlier date has the following:

"We learn that an official despatch has been received by Governor Urrutia, from Lieut. J. G. Strain, in charge of United States Darien exploring expedition, in which this officer reports to his Excellency, that he had arrived at Carthagena, in the United States sloop-of-war Cyane, Commander Hollins; and encloses letters from Don V. de D. Paredes, representative at Washington from this Government, informing him of the object of the expedition.

"The Governor of Carthagena had shown every courtesy to the officers of the expedition and of the Cyane.

"We learn that Commander Hollins, who has general charge of the expedition, expected to sail for Caledonia Bay, immediately after the arrival at Carthagena of Col. Cadozzi, who has been appointed by this Government (as we have before published) to command the body of troops intended to act as escort to the exploring expeditions. At least, Capt. Hollins would wait until the 12th inst., when, if Col. C. had not arrived, he would proceed at all events to Caledonia Bay."

Hon. James Savage, in his notice of Rev. Cotton Mather, in connection with the famous witch trials in Massachusetts Colony, says of him, that "instead of weighing evidence, he had not discretion enough to be trusted to *wipe the scales.*"